

Date: Sat, 11 Jun 94 04:30:07 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #651
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Sat, 11 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 651

Today's Topics:

 "73's" (2 msgs)
 ** TELNET CALL-SIGN ADDRESS?? **
 10-10 group?
 FCC Database
 Icom R100

Militia Weapons (Was: We interrupt this program to bring you an important message...

 Singapore HAM Laws?
 VHF Maritime Outrage!! (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 10 Jun 94 12:14:16 -0500
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.tufts.edu!
news.hnrc.tufts.edu!jerry@ames.arpa
Subject: "73's"
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <2t2g87\$cka@chnews.intel.com>, cmoore@ilx018.intel.com (Cecil A. Moore
-FT-~) writes:

> Weuchsowagan (wjturner@iastate.edu) wrote:

>

> : As I said before, WHICH EDITION? We could have different editions.

> : Will Turner, NORDV

>

> How about _Webster's Third New International_?

Ick! :-)

As has already been stated, style guides are better sources of authoritative information. Even though English is a living language and the Third International is the latest version, many knowledgeable individuals feel that the Third is inferior to the Second. My 1950 New Collegiate, based on the Second International, had the good sense to say regarding punctuation, on page 1193, "An apostrophe followed by an s is used to form the plurals of figures . . . but forms omitting the apostrophe are gaining ground." It refers the reader to section 12 of Orthography (page 1186), which states, "Plurals of . . . figures . . . are formed by adding -s. An apostrophe which according to the older convention regularly preceded the -s is omitted by more and more writers and printers where no ambiguity is likely."

Date: 10 Jun 1994 17:16:05 GMT
From: lll-winken.llnl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!
cmoore@ames.arpa
Subject: "73's"
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Jerry Dallal (jerry@hnrc.tufts.edu) wrote:

: feel that the Third is inferior to the Second. My 1950 New Collegiate,
: based on the Second International, had the good sense to say regarding

Hi Jerry, there was no argument that 73s was not the plural of 73. The argument was that 73's was not the plural of 73. Will made fun of 73's as a plural and I responded. I agree that 73s, 73-s, and 73's are all acceptable ways to pluralize 73. The point is that, although maybe not the preferred way, 73's is a perfectly acceptable way to pluralize 73. It may be senseless to pluralize "Best Regards" but there are certainly a lot of 73's in this posting.

73, KG7BK, CecilMoore@delphi.com

Date: 11 Jun 94 04:59:44 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!news.duke.edu!
eff!neoucom.edu!news.ysu.edu!yfn.ysu.edu!at286@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: ** TELNET CALL-SIGN ADDRESS?? **
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Does anyone reading this message know the telnet site (and address)
where one can find the most up-to-date call-sign directory??

73

Merle n0zkf

rutschke@sendit.nodak.edu

--

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 1994 20:43:33 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!
news.cs.indiana.edu!noose.ecn.purdue.edu!constellation.ecn.purdue.edu!
wb9omc@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 10-10 group?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Some time back I posted looking for internet hams who might also be
members of 10-10 International. This was for the purpose of gauging
how much interest there might be in forming an offshoot newsgroup
of rec.radio.amateur.tenten or something like that.

Much to my surprise, I got some email from interested persons. I
wouldn't say that I was flooded with it, but if you consider that
around 66,000 membership numbers in 10-10 have been issued out of
maybe half a million US hams (plus some number of DX stations who
are members) and that only a limited subset of licensed hams have
access to the internet anyway, well.....I didn't expect to be
drowning in replies. :-)

Suffice to say that the interest has been enough to push me into
coming back to get more "official" about it.

As a general statement of purpose, the group would be to assist members
of 10-10 in setting up skeds and so forth and dealing with the current
downturn in 10 meters. Plus it would give a somewhat less cluttered
forum for such interested parties to share information and other
material relating to 10-10 activities.

While I realize that to some it would appear more like a group
dedicated to an organization, I should say that the entire goal of
10-10 International in the first place was to foster interest and
use of the 10 meter band. The concept of "use it or lose it"
comes into play, and now that the FCC is stuck being deluged with
commercial interests such a group might be beneficial for the

purpose of keeping UP useage of ten meters.

NOW - having said all that shtick, I realize that there are some fairly well-defined steps including but not limited to the RFD's and CFV's and all that stuff. :-)

My problem - I don't really know diddle about the sysadm end of things and quite frankly stuff like news.groups drives me up a wall.

S0000000 - what I need to find (ideally) would be a ham-internet person who DOES have a pretty decent working knowledge of all that good stuff to help me get the ball rolling. Whether it ever comes down to a vote and whether or not such a vote would go yea or nay will require a bit more expertise on these internet issues than I currently have.

OK - got anybody out there who fits this description and wants to help?

Duane
WB9OMC
wb9omc@harbor.ecn.purdue.edu

Date: 10 Jun 94 13:38:52 -0800
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!swrinde!
elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!nic-nac.CSU.net!vax.sonoma.edu!harrisok@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: FCC Database
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <Cr6r4L.68x@freenet.buffalo.edu>, aa450@freenet.buffalo.edu (Kurt Rieder) writes:

>
> In a previous article, georget@max.tiac.net (George Turner) says:
>
>>Could some tell me how to get a ham 's name and address using his
>>call sign. Thought that I seen a ftp or usenet address that had the data base.
>>
> George,
>
> Try electra.cs.buffalo.edu for US/Can. database. The search engine
> is very good inasmuch as you can search for call, name, city, state,
> zip, etc.
> --

Better yet, try: callsign.cs.buffalo.edu 2000
via Telnet.
Using the 2000 port gets you right on without having to log on or have an

account.

Ken Harrison
N6MHG
email: harrisok@sonoma.edu

Date: 10 Jun 1994 19:25:16 -0400
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!panix!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Icom R100
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Earlier this week I posted the following to rec.radio.scanner and
rec.radio.amateur.equipment:

I have a friend who is interested in the Icom R100. If you have
experience with this radio, he'd appreciate hearing your comments
(both pro and con) as well as alternative suggestions. Pointers
to anyplace where discussions about the R100 might be archived
would also be useful. I'll forward replies.

Well, either nobody feels very strongly about this radio, or all of
you R100 owners (or former owners) assumed that somebody else would
answer. The only substantive reply I got was from Richard Crisp.
(Thank you Richard).

So this is a second attempt. I'll also add that I seem to remember
that there was a series of several Icom wideband receivers (possibly
including the R1 and the R100) which were not too well received (no
pun intended). I recall hearing about problems with important
characteristics like selectivity. Is there any truth to this
(specifically with respect to the R100)?

-Thanx
-Adam (N2DHH)

adam@panix.com

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 1994 16:11:11 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
bglover@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Militia Weapons (Was: We interrupt this program to bring you an important
message...

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 1994 14:26:00 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!newsserver.jvnc.net!raffles.technet.sg!ntuix!
ntuvax.ntu.ac.sg!asirene@ames.arpa
Subject: Singapore HAM Laws?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <9405077710.AA771034801@smtpgty.anatcp.rockwell.com>,
William_A_Kirsanoff@ccmail.anatcp.rockwell.COM (William A. Kirsanoff) writes:
> Nick Stefanisko [stefanis@hp-ptp.ptp.hp.com] writes:

>
> Newbee alert!! This is my first time posting here.
>
> I'm in Singapore right now. And I was wondering, the next time I'm
> here, should I bring my radio? What are the laws regarding 2m and
> 70cm transition here. I've talked to a bunch of people here in
> Singapore and they have no clue. I think there is a well established
> radio-phone network here, so I would not be surprised to find out that
> HAM is not allowed.
>
> I just want to find out before I have to find out the hard way.
>
> And I recommend:
>
> You'll want to check with the authorities before you bring a radio in.
> Several of the Asian countries get a bit testy about radios that can
> receive their police and government frequencies. I think Singapore is one
> of them. Singapore does require a license (licence over there :-)) for
> receivers, and I am sure there will be some paperwork involved for an
> amateur radio license. I believe the people to contact will be the
> Singapore Broadcasting Corporation (SBC), they do the licensing for
> broadcast receivers. If that does not work, try the post office.

Wrong, the SBC does NOT handle radio licensing. TAS, Telecoms
Authorities of Singapore does and their contact number is 5383388 or try
5306638 and ask for Wendy.

>
> After you get back to the U.S., the ARRL or the Singapore Embassy could
> help. The embassy number is 202-667-7555.

I don't think the embassy will be too helpful.

>

> As far as being a newbie, don't worry about it, everyone was once. And
> don't let Derek "Grumpy" Wills bother you, he's generally a good guy, just
> has a thing about HAM vs ham vs ham radio . . . :-)
>
> One last note: isn't the coffee there great! Even Mc Donald's serves a
> good, strong cup that's not bitter (sigh). Can't get coffee like that here.
>
> 73
>
>
> -----
> Wm. A. Kirsanoff Internet: WAKIRSAN@ananov.remnet.ab.com
> Rockwell International Ham: KD6MCI
> (714) 762-2872
> Alternate Internet: william_a._kirsanoff@ccmail.anatcp.rockwell.com
> -----
> Who are you? * I am number 2. * Who is number 1? * You are number 6.
> -----
>
>
>
>
>

73

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 1994 11:49:12
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!
news.duke.edu!eff!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!ornews.intel.com!
ccm.hf.intel.com!@@ihnp4.ucsd.edu
Subject: VHF Maritime Outrage!!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jun10.155646.6575@news.yale.edu> revco@YALE.EDU (Jim Revkin)
writes:

>I'd be interested in hearing the group's feelings about new FCC
>licensing fees for VHF maritime transceivers. In my view this is
>an outrage.

I totally agree. A marine radio is a piece of safety equipment, not a luxury
item. This will either cause bootleg operations, or fewer boats to have
radios.

Brett Miller N70LQ

brett_miller@ccm.hf.intel.com

Intel Corp.
American Fork, UT

Date: Fri, 10 Jun 1994 15:56:46 GMT
From: yale.edu!news.yale.edu!revco@yale.arpa
Subject: VHF Maritime Outrage!!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I'd be interested in hearing the group's feelings about new FCC licensing fees for VHF maritime transceivers. In my view this is an outrage. The availability of VHF Maritime transceivers should be facilitated, in my view, NOT impeded, for safety reasons. It is quite possible, if not probable, that a mariner with a VHF transceiver might be within closer range of a sailor in distress, than the US Coast Guard, or other parties. I can recall being stranded in a 22 ft sailboat, in a thunderstorm, with no wind, and only a VHF HT on board. To charge a licensure fee (>\$100) which might represent anywhere from 30 to 75% of the value of a transceiver is absurd.

My other concern, of course, is that we will see reinstituted, licensure fees for amateur licenses. fyi:

>From the BOAT/U.S. Newswire, 6/10/94: FCC ADOPTS HIGHER MARINE RADIO LICENSE FEES

Contact: David Pilvelait, boatus@aol.com

WASHINGTON, DC - A spokesperson for the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) told BOAT/U.S. today that the Commission has voted to increase the cost of licensing a VHF marine radio from \$35 to \$105. The formal announcement of the increase will appear in the Federal Register next Monday or Tuesday and the increase will become effective 30 days from that day, which would be on or about July 13.

The spokesperson also said the fees - \$35 for the license application and \$7 per year, or \$70, for the 10-year term of the "ship's station" license - would be in effect for 1994 and that the FCC "would entertain comments for changes in the fee structure" for 1995 and future years in a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for the '95 fees, to be issued in a couple of months.

-0-

BOAT/U.S. Newswire

--
James H. Revkin, M.D. KA1QJ
revco@revco.med.yale.edu

Date: 10 Jun 1994 08:40:45 -0600

From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!

mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10.cs.du.edu!not-for-mail@ames.arpa

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <199406071807.LAA19308@ucsd.edu>, <rogjdCr2voM.4IA@netcom.com>,
<CSLE87-090694095911@145.39.1.10>spool.m

Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <CSLE87-090694095911@145.39.1.10>,
Karl Beckman <CSLE87@email.mot.com> wrote:

>Open repeaters weren't the original issue in the thread (which is still

>running in r.r.a.policy, by the way). The issue was the refusal of a

>coordinating committee to allow more than one repeater per channel, despite

>the FCC requirement for channel sharing and non-exclusive use of any given

>frequency.

When I jumped into it, early on, the issue was the band being full of closed repeaters. There were two solutions proposed: Roger's communist idea of forcing all repeaters to be open, and your idea of forcing repeater trustees to share channels. Neither one is politically feasible.

>Open repeaters weren't the issue, access to spectrum was and

>continues to be the problem.

To Roger, open repeaters ARE the issue: if the 440 band wasn't full of closed repeaters, he and his buddies could get a free ride on someone else's work by hanging out on an open repeater.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@admin5.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

To Sarah Brady, Howard Metzenbaum, Dianne Feinstein, and Charles Schumer:

Thanks. Without you, I would be neither a gun owner nor an NRA life member.

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #651
